



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,896	10/15/2001	Cheol-Woong Lee	205,330	3473

826 7590 01/03/2006

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/977,896	LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Popham	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Crill does not teach collecting an illegally reproduced digital music file according to a kind of music of the digital music file, as recited in the amended independent claims. Crill does teach this feature by providing a comparison between lower resolution versions of the candidate and reference images (Column 16, line 65 to Column 21, line 47). As can be seen in Column 20, lines 28-59, the lower resolution candidate image is compared against the lower resolution reference image via a string of numbers. The total difference between the 2 strings is computed, and the higher the total, the greater the difference between the string of numbers, and thus the greater the difference between the candidate image and the reference image. A smaller difference would equate to a closer match between the two images, and since a particular kind of music would have images closer to each other, the smaller difference would show a correspondence in kind of music.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2137

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crill (U.S. Patent 6,445,822) in view of Gutberlet (Gutberlet, L., "Peer-to-Peer Computing – A Technology Fad or Fact?", 10/10/2000, pp. 1-16).

Regarding Claim 1,

Crill discloses a method of preventing reduction of sales amount of records due to a digital music file illegally distributed through a communication network, comprising:

a) collecting an illegally produced digital music file according to a kind of music of the digital music file, which is derived from a record of a cooperating records corporation, by searching the network (Column 2, lines 53-56; Column 16, lines 33-41; and Column 20, lines 28-59);

but does not disclose encrypting the collected digital music file with a predetermined key or redistributing the encrypted digital music file through the network.

Gutberlet, however, discloses b) encrypting the collected digital music file with a predetermined key (Pages 7-8, Section 3.1.1 Digital Rights Management (DRM)); and c) redistributing the encrypted digital music file through the network (Pages 7-8, Section 3.1.1 Digital Rights Management (DRM)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the DRM

system of Gutberlet into the searching system of Crill in order to protect the copyrights of an entity through licensing and distribution of keys.

Regarding Claim 2,

Crill as modified by Gutberlet discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Gutberlet discloses that at step a) and c) the collection and redistribution of the digital music file are performed by using a popular digital file sharing program (Pages 3-4, Section 2.1.2 The Hybrid Model (Napster); and Pages 13-14, Section 4.3 An Agent Watching for Micropayments).

Regarding Claim 3,

Crill as modified by Gutberlet discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Gutberlet discloses that at step a) and c) the collection and redistribution of the digital music file are performed by using a popular digital file sharing server (Pages 3-4, Section 2.1.2 The Hybrid Model (Napster); and Pages 13-14, Section 4.3 An Agent Watching for Micropayments).

3. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crill in view of Gutberlet, further in view of Schneier (Schneier, B., "Applied Cryptography", 1996, Volume 2, pp. 4-5).

Regarding Claim 4,

Crill as modified by Gutberlet does not disclose that at step b) the collected digital music file is encrypted by a public key encryption algorithm.

Schneier, however, discloses that at step b) the collected digital music file is encrypted by a public key encryption algorithm (Pages 4-5, Section Public-Key Algorithms). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the encryption method of Schneier into the searching system of Crill as modified by Gutberlet in order to obtain a secure form of encryption, in which only the desired party holding the proper private key can decrypt the information being sent.

Regarding Claim 5,

Crill as modified by Gutberlet does not disclose that at step b) the collected digital music file is encrypted by a public key encryption algorithm.

Schneier, however, discloses that at step b) the collected digital music file is encrypted by a public key encryption algorithm (Pages 4-5, Section Public-Key Algorithms). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the encryption method of Schneier into the searching system of Crill as modified by Gutberlet in order to obtain a secure form of encryption, in

which only the desired party holding the proper private key can decrypt the information being sent.

Regarding Claim 6,

Crill as modified by Gutberlet does not disclose that at step b) the collected digital music file is encrypted by a public key encryption algorithm.

Schneier, however, discloses that at step b) the collected digital music file is encrypted by a public key encryption algorithm (Pages 4-5, Section Public-Key Algorithms). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the encryption method of Schneier into the searching system of Crill as modified by Gutberlet in order to obtain a secure form of encryption, in which only the desired party holding the proper private key can decrypt the information being sent.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crill in view of Cooperman (U.S. Patent 5,613,004).

Crill discloses a method of preventing reduction of sales amount of records due to a digital music file distributed through a communication network, comprising:

a) collecting an illegally produced music file according to a kind of music of the digital music file, which is derived from a record of a cooperating record

corporation, by searching the network (Column 2, lines 53-56; Column 16, lines 33-41' and Column 20, lines 28-59);

but does not disclose inserting a watermark containing a predetermined secret information in the collected digital music file or redistributing the watermarked digital music file through the network.

Cooperman, however, discloses b) inserting a watermark containing a predetermined secret information in the collected digital music file (Column 15, lines 33-35), and c) redistributing the watermarked digital music file through the network (Column 15, lines 36-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the watermarking method of Cooperman into the searching system of Crill in order to be able to determine who the copy is licensed to, so that proper action can be taken (Column 15, lines 39-53).

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crill in view of Cooperman, further in view of Gutberlet.

Regarding Claim 8,

Crill as modified by Cooperman does not disclose that at step a) and c) the collection and redistribution of the digital music file are performed by using a popular digital file sharing program.

Gutberlet, however, discloses that at step a) and c) the collection and redistribution of the digital music file are performed by using a popular

digital file sharing program (Pages 3-4, Section 2.1.2 The Hybrid Model (Napster); and Pages 13-14, Section 4.3 An Agent Watching for Micropayments). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the P2P system of Gutberlet into the searching system of Crill as modified by Cooperman in order to provide a directory server that the user must connect to in order to obtain location information for a certain piece of data, thus enabling tracking of downloads.

Regarding Claim 9,

Crill as modified by Cooperman does not disclose that at step a) and c) the collection and redistribution of the digital music file are performed by using a popular digital file sharing server.

Gutberlet, however, discloses that at step a) and c) the collection and redistribution of the digital music file are performed by using a popular digital file sharing server (Pages 3-4, Section 2.1.2 The Hybrid Model (Napster); and Pages 13-14, Section 4.3 An Agent Watching for Micropayments). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the P2P system of Gutberlet into the searching system of Crill as modified by Cooperman in order to provide a directory server that the user must connect to in order to obtain location information for a certain piece of data, thus enabling tracking of downloads.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crill in view of Gutberlet, further in view of Duplic8 ("Duplicate file manager", 10/9/1999, pp. 1-5, obtained from

<http://web.archive.org/web/19991009064724/http://www.bigwig.net/silicon/duplic8/>).

Crill as modified by Gutberlet discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Crill discloses collecting the illegally produced digital music file (Column 2, lines 53-56; Column 16, lines 33-41; and Column 20, lines 28-59), but Crill as modified by Gutberlet does not disclose selecting one of a plurality of digital music files having a same name, size, and playing time.

Duplic8, however, discloses selecting one of a plurality of digital music files having a same name, size, and playing time (Pages 2-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the duplicate file manager of Duplic8 into the searching system of Crill as modified by Gutberlet in order to save space in the candidate image databases by deleting unnecessary duplicate files, thus allowing the databases to hold more relevant data.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crill in view of Cooperman, further in view of Duplic8.

Crill as modified by Cooperman discloses the method of claim 1, in addition, Crill discloses collecting the illegally produced digital music file (Column

2, lines 53-56; Column 16, lines 33-41; and Column 20, lines 28-59), but Crill as modified by Cooperman does not disclose selecting one of a plurality of digital music files having a same name, size, and playing time.

Duplic8, however, discloses selecting one of a plurality of digital music files having a same name, size, and playing time (Pages 2-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the duplicate file manager of Duplic8 into the searching system of Crill as modified by Cooperman in order to save space in the candidate image databases by deleting unnecessary duplicate files, thus allowing the databases to hold more relevant data.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER